UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/811,482	03/26/2004	Mika Kalenius	944-004.046	8878

4955   7590   01/26/2009
WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & ADOLPHSON, LLP
BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5
755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224
MONROE, CT 06468

EXAMINER
WONG, WILLIAM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/26/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 November 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,4,9-11,18,20,21,23,24,26,27 and 29* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,4,9-11,18,20,21,23,24,26,27 and 29* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the communication filed on 11/25/2008.

- Claims 1, 18, 21, 24, and 27 have been amended.

- Claims 2, 5-8, 12-17, 19, 22, 25, and 28 have been previously cancelled.

Claims 1, 3-4, 9-11, 18, 20-21, 23-24, 26-27, and 29 are pending and have been

examined. Previous objections and rejections not included in this office action have

been withdrawn. Previous 35 USC 101 rejections with respect to claims 24 and 26

have been withdrawn in view of amendments. Previous prior art rejections are

maintained.

Claim Objections

1.   Claims 1, 10, 11, 18, 21, 22, 24, and 27 are objected to because of the following

informalities: As per claim 1, "said" and "the" are used when referring to the same thing

(e.g." said content" and "the content", "said second rendering mode" and "the second

rendering mode", "said information" and "the information", etc.). The claims should be

consistent in the terminology used for the purpose of clarity. The comma after "the

content" should be removed. It is unclear whether "if said indication was affirmative" in

line 11 is modifying "storing information", or both "correlating… and storing information".

It is suggested that the instances of "if" be replaced with "when" to clearly indicate that

the claim is directed that particular situation, and is not missing information. The above

issues similarly apply to claims 18, 21, 24, and 27. As per claim 10, there is lack of

antecedent basis for "the user". It is noted that claim 11 appears to be a duplicate of

claim 21. As per claims 11, 21, and 22, the claims are objected for lacking clear support

or antecedent basis for the term "computer-readable medium" (See MPEP 608.01(o)).

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of
> making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the
> art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall
> set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3.   Claims 1, 3-4, 9-11, 18, 20-21, 23-24, 26-27, and 29 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in

such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the

inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed

invention.

The claims were amended from the original disclosure to recite "said revised

version having been revised during a time interval after said showing of the content

according to said second rendering mode, and before said using the information to

show the revised version,... wherein said revised version of the content has been

revised between said request to close the content and said next access, even if said

indication whether to save the second rendering mode was affirmative".

As understood by examiner from the remarks, applicant appears to provide

support for the above limitations with what is described on page 4 lines 20-24 in the

specification, which recites "When the user next accesses the web page/document, that web page/document will automatically start out in the rendering mode saved by the user last time, even if *the content of the web page/document has been changed by someone else during the time interval when the user was not accessing it*", with the intent that "a revised version of content" refer to the changed content described above.

However, this is not sufficient to support the above limitations. In regards to the first limitation (revised during a time interval after said showing of the content according to said second rendering mode, and before said using the information to show the revised version), there is no indication that the user does not still have access to the content during the time after said showing step. Furthermore, when collecting the request to close the content, the content still has not been closed and, as such, it would be reasonable for the user to still have access to the content unless otherwise stated. In regards to the second limitation (revised between said request to close the content and said next access), but also applies to the first limitation, a request to close the content is only a request and does not necessitate that the content actually be closed. Therefore, for example, there is no reason that the user would not still have access to the content when deciding whether or not to save mode. As such, the claims do not recite that which is described in the original disclosure. The above limitations constitute new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1, 3-4, 9-11, 18, 20-21, 23-24, 26-27, and 29 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robotham et al. (US 2002/0015042 A1) in

view of Kendall et al. (US 2005/0193053 A1) and Kraus et al. (US 6266684 B1).

As per claim 1, Robotham teaches **a method, comprising: upon accessing

content, displaying the content on a display screen in a first rendering mode,

collecting a selection of a second rendering mode, showing the content

according to said second rendering mode, correlating the second rendering

mode to an origin of the content, and during a next access,** showing **a revised

version of the content from said origin in the second rendering mode instead of

the first rendering mode, said revised version having been revised during a time

interval after said showing of the content according to said second rendering

mode and before said** showing **the revised version** (e.g. in paragraph 502 on page

37, "The rendering technique used for the detail representation

can be set by user preference… User interface 9 can allow the

user switch back and forth between rendering techniques", in

paragraph 204 and 207 on page 17, "A selection bookmark can specify or

prioritize the type of rendering used for the region of

interest…", in paragraphs 426-430 on page 32, and in paragraph 29 on page 3; the

user is able to specify or change rendering preferences stored on the server or client

device, so that content will be rendered according to those preferences when it is

accessed or subsequently accessed), **wherein the second rendering mode**

comprises a normal rendering mode, a re-authored mode, a narrow small screen

rendering mode, or comprises an overview according to a thumbnail small screen

rendering mode (e.g. in paragraph 18 on page 2 in view of paragraph 11 on page 1

describes source transcoding which includes re-authoring; paragraph 26 on page 3

describes TSSR and paragraph 30 on page 3 describes NSSR), but does not

specifically teach **collecting a request to close the content and subsequently**

inquiring whether to save the second rendering mode for said content, collecting

an indication whether to save the second rendering mode for said content,

storing information if said indication was affirmative, and using said information

if the indication was affirmative, wherein said revised version of content is

accessible without a bookmark, and wherein said revised version of the content

has been revised between said request to close the content and said next access,

even if said indication whether to save the second rendering mode was

affirmative. However, Kendall teaches a revised version of content in a next access

(the content is arranged in different format from the first format) being accessible

without a bookmark (e.g. in paragraphs 14 and 36-37), wherein the revisions may be

stored upon leaving (i.e. closing) the content. It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Robotham to

include the teachings of Kendall for the purpose of automatically applying preferred

rendering preferences for the content based on a URL or network path. Kraus teaches

inquiring whether to save changes to the rendering mode upon closing content and if an

indication is "Yes", executing the save operation (e.g. in column 6 lines 39-42 and

column 7 lines 24-28, saving causes changes to be reflected in subsequent accesses).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to

modify the teachings of Robotham and Kendall to include the inquiring and saving of

Kraus for the purpose of providing users control over whether preference changes are

saved and prompting the user when a preference change needs to be decided on. It is

noted that since the request to close the content occurs before the request to save the

new format (causing the revising), the combination meets the requirements for when

revising occurs as specified in the claim.

As per claim 3, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Robotham further

teaches **wherein the content is accessed via the internet** (e.g. in paragraph 64 on

page 5, "the client machine 24 becomes a node on the Internet,

capable of exchanging data with other Internet computers. The

browser controls the content presented on a client viewport 16

of the display 5. With the client connected as an Internet node,

the browser enables specified documents to be located, fetched

from a server and displayed", and in paragraph 429 on page 32, "Screening

decisions can be based on criteria such as the type of the

visual content element 10, the type of constituent component(s)

12, and its network location… The network location can be

derived from information such as the URL of a Web-based visual

content element 10 or constituent component 12").

As per claim 4, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Robotham further

teaches **wherein the first rendering mode is a default rendering mode** (e.g. in

paragraph 86-87 on page 7, *visual consistency* and *user profile consistency* establish

default rendering modes) **specified by a provider of the content in source code** (e.g.

in paragraph 78 on page 6, "The server 22 accesses the visual content

elements 10 and their constituent components 12, provides the

rendering functions, and transforms the rendered bitmap into a

format convenient for the display on the client device 24", in

paragraph 4 and in paragraph 8).

As per claim 9, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and Robotham further

teaches **wherein the content accessed via the internet requires downloading an**

amount of data dependent upon what rendering mode is employed (e.g. in

paragraph 112 on page 9, "clipping 82 can be used, for example, to

remove unwanted regions of the proxy display surface 28 such as

"white space," unwanted advertising banners, and/or regions that

are considered less important to the user" and in paragraph 487 on page

36, "The server 22 can retain the data that identifies the

"target" or associated URL of the hyper-link while sending the

client 24 a more compact identifier for the "target"

information… Consequently, the amount of data transmitted to the

client 24 and the client's required capabilities are reduced").

As per claim 10, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Robotham further

teaches **wherein the method is performed iteratively if the user has a change of**

preference (e.g. in paragraph 73 on pages 5-6, "event processing occurs

cyclically, with events caused by user actions transmitted to

the server, and appropriately updated display information

provided to the client").

As per claim 11, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Robotham further

teaches **a computer-readable medium storing computer executable code** (e.g. in

paragraph 62 on page 5 and in paragraph 272 on page 22).

Claims 18 and 20 are method claims corresponding to the method claims 1 and 3

respectively, and are rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection with the

rejection of claims 1 and 3. It is noted that, in the combination, showing the revised

version is without further indication of a user preference in the next access (e.g.

Kendall, in paragraphs 14 and 36-37).

Claims 21 and 23 are computer-readable medium claims corresponding to the

method claims 1 and 3 respectively, and are rejected under the same reasons set forth

in connection with the rejection of claims 1 and 3.

Claims 24 and 26 are terminal claims corresponding to the method claims 1 and

3 respectively, and are rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection with the

rejection of claims 1 and 3. Robotham further teaches a display or other hardware (e.g.

in paragraphs 29 and 63).

Claims 27 and 29 are terminal claims corresponding to the method claims 1 and

3 respectively, and are rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection with the

rejection of claims 1 and 3. Robotham further teaches a display screen (e.g. in

paragraphs 29 and 63) and user input device (e.g. in paragraphs 266-267).

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments filed 11/25/2008 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one

cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections

are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208

USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir.

1986).

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain

features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies

(i.e., change content between accesses and rendering mode unalterable during those

content changes) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are

interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into

the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

The claims do not specifically recite how the content is revised, and as such, a different

rendering mode for the content would reasonably be considered "a revised version".

Furthermore, the claim itself appears to suggest that the content with a different

rendering mode is "a revised version of the content", the revising being caused by

saving the new rendering mode (e.g. "storing information about said correlating... during

next access, using said information to show a revised version of the content...in the

second rendering mode instead of the first rendering mode"). The combination of

references teaches the claimed limitations and, as such, the rejection stands.

Conclusion

7.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

US 6326982 B1	Method and apparatus for automatically accessing web pages based on television programming information	Wu; Bo et al.
US 6665860 B1	Sever-based method and apparatus for enabling client systems on a network to present results of software execution in any of multiple selectable render modes	DeSantis; Robert P. et al.
US 20050188318 A1	Method and apparatus for providing dynamic information to a user via a visual display	Tamir, Moshe et al.
US 6980213 B1	Terminal device for mobile communication	Hirose; Takako et al.
US 7149982 B1	System and method for saving user-specified views of internet web page displays	Duperrouzel; Brian Gerard et al.

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to WILLIAM WONG whose telephone number is 571-270-

1399. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/William Wong/
Examiner, Art Unit 2178

/Adam L Basehoar/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178